arXiv:0807.4657v1 [math.AP] 29 Jul 2008

Non-diffusive large time behaviour for a degenerate viscous Hamilton-Jacobi equation

Philippe Laurençot*

July 29, 2008

Abstract

The convergence to non-diffusive self-similar solutions is investigated for non-negative solutions to the Cauchy problem $\partial_t u = \Delta_p u + |\nabla u|^q$ when the initial data converge to zero at infinity. Sufficient conditions on the exponents $p > 2$ and $q > 1$ are given that guarantee that the diffusion becomes negligible for large times and the L^∞-norm of $u(t)$ converges to a positive value as $t \to \infty$.

1 Introduction

The quasilinear degenerate parabolic equation

$$\partial_t u = \Delta_p u + |\nabla u|^q \ , \quad (t,x) \in Q_\infty := (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N \,, \tag{1.1}$$

includes two competing mechanisms acting on the space variable x, a degenerate diffusion $\Delta_p u$ involving the p-Laplacian operator defined by

$$\Delta_p u := \text{ div } \left(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \, \nabla u \right) \ , \quad p > 2 \,,$$

and a source term $|\nabla u|^q$, $q > 1$, depending solely on the gradient of u. The aim of this work is to identify a range of the parameters p and q for which the large time behaviour of non-negative solutions to (1.1) is dominated by the source term. More precisely, we consider the Cauchy problem and supplement (1.1) with the initial condition

$$u(0) = u_0 \geq 0 \,, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N \,. \tag{1.2}$$

---

*Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, CNRS UMR 5219, Université de Toulouse, 118 route de Narbonne, F–31062 Toulouse Cedex 9, France. E-mail: Philippe.Laurencot@math.univ-toulouse.fr, Internet: http://www.mip.ups-tlse.fr/∼laurenco/

Throughout the paper, the initial condition u_0 is assumed to fulfill

$$u_0 \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^N)\,, \quad u_0 \ge 0\,, \quad u_0 \not\equiv 0\,, \tag{1.3}$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^N) := \left\{ w \in \mathcal{BC}(\mathbb{R}^N) \ : \ \lim_{R\to\infty} \sup_{\{|x|\ge R\}} \{|w(x)|\} = 0 \right\}\,,$$

and $\mathcal{BC}(\mathbb{R}^N) := \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

For such an initial condition, the Cauchy problem (1.1), (1.2) has a unique non-negative (viscosity) solution $u \in \mathcal{BC}([0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N)$ (see Proposition 2.1 below). Moreover, $t \longmapsto \|u(t)\|_\infty$ is a non-increasing function and has a limit $M_\infty \in [0, \|u_0\|_\infty]$ as $t \to \infty$. Our main result is then the following:

Theorem 1.1 *Assume that* $p > 2$ *and* $q \in (1,p)$. *Consider a non-negative function* u_0 *satisfying* (1.3) *and let* u *be the corresponding (viscosity) solution to* (1.1), (1.2). *Assume further that*

$$M_\infty := \lim_{t\to\infty} \|u(t)\|_\infty > 0\,. \tag{1.4}$$

Then

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \|u(t) - h_\infty(t)\|_\infty = 0\,, \tag{1.5}$$

where h_∞ *is given by*

$$h_\infty(t,x) := H_\infty\left(\frac{x}{t^{1/q}}\right) \qquad \text{and} \qquad H_\infty(x) := \left(M_\infty - \gamma_q\ |x|^{q/(q-1)}\right)_+ \tag{1.6}$$

for $(t,x) \in Q_\infty$ *and* $\gamma_q := (q-1)\ q^{-q/(q-1)}$.

Here and below, $r_+ := \max\{r,0\}$ denotes the positive part of the real number r.

The convergence (1.5) clearly indicates that the large time behaviour of non-negative solutions to (1.1), (1.2) fulfilling the condition (1.4) is governed by the gradient source term. Indeed, h_∞ is actually a self-similar solution to the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\partial_t h = |\nabla h|^q\ , \quad (t,x) \in Q_\infty\,, \tag{1.7}$$

and an alternative formula for h_∞ reads

$$h_\infty(t,x) = \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^N} \left\{ M_\infty\ \mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}(y) - \gamma_q\ \frac{|x-y|^{q/(q-1)}}{t^{1/(q-1)}} \right\} \tag{1.8}$$

for $(t,x) \in [0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N$, $\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}$ denoting the indicator function of the singleton set $\{0\}$. The formula (1.8) is the well-known Hopf-Lax-Oleinik representation formula for viscosity solutions to (1.7) (see, e.g., [10, Chapter 3]) and h_∞ turns out to be the unique viscosity solution in $\mathcal{BUC}(Q_\infty)$ to (1.7) with the bounded and upper semicontinuous initial condition $h_\infty(0,x) = \mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ [23].

Remark 1.2 *The convergence* (1.5) *also holds true for the viscosity solution to the Hamilton-Jacobi equation* (1.7) *with a non-negative initial condition* $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^N)$ *but with* $\|u_0\|_\infty$ *instead of* M_∞ *in the formula* (1.6) *giving* H_∞*. For* (1.1), (1.2), *the constant* M_∞ *takes into account that, though negligible for large times, the diffusion erodes the supremum of* u *during the time evolution.*

For $p = 2$, Theorem 1.1 is also valid and is proved in [7], the proof relying on a rescaling technique: The crucial step is then to identify the possible limits of the rescaled sequence and this is done by an extensive use of the Hopf-Lax-Oleinik representation formula. The proof we perform here is of a completely different nature and relies on the relaxed half-limits method introduced in [3]. A similar approach has been used in [21] and [22] to investigate the large time behaviour of solutions to first-order Hamilton-Jacobi equations $\partial_t w + H(x, \nabla w) = 0$ in Q_∞. It has also been used in [19] to study the convergence to non-diffusive localized self-similar patterns for non-negative and compactly supported solutions to $\partial_t w - \Delta_p w + |\nabla w|^q = 0$ in Q_∞ when $p > 2$ and $q \in (1, p-1)$.

In order to apply Theorem 1.1, one should check whether there are non-negative solutions to (1.1), (1.2) for which (1.4) holds true. The next result provides sufficient conditions for (1.4) to be fulfilled.

Theorem 1.3 *Assume that* $p > 2$ *and* $q > 1$*. Consider a non-negative function* u_0 *satisfying* (1.3) *and let* u *be the corresponding solution to* (1.1), (1.2)*. Introducing*

$$q_\star := p - \frac{N}{N+1}\,, \tag{1.9}$$

then u *fulfills* (1.4) *if*

(a) either $q \in (1, q_\star]$,

(b) or $q \in (q_\star, p)$, $u_0 \in W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, *and*

$$\|u_0\|_\infty > \kappa_0 \left| \inf_{y\in\mathbb{R}^N} \{\Delta_p u_0(y)\} \right|^{(p-q)/q} . \tag{1.10}$$

for some $\kappa_0 > 0$ *which depends only on* N, p, *and* q.

A similar result is already available for $p = 2$ and has been established in [7, 12]. The proof of Theorem 1.3 for $q \in (p-1, p)$ and $p > 2$ borrows some steps from the case $p = 2$. However, it relies on semiconvexity estimates for solutions to (1.1), (1.2) which seem to be new for $p > 2$ and $q \in (1, p)$ and are stated now.

Proposition 1.4 *Assume that* $p > 2$ *and* $q \in (1, p]$*. Let* u *be the viscosity solution to* (1.1), (1.2) *with initial condition* $u_0 \in \mathcal{BUC}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ *(that is,* $u_0 \in \mathcal{BC}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ *and is uniformly continuous* *in $\mathbb{R}^N$). Then $\nabla u(t)$ belongs to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for each $t>0$ and there is $\kappa_1>0$ depending only on N, p, and q such that*

$$\Delta_p u(t,x) \ge -\kappa_1 \, \|u(s)\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q} \, (t-s)^{-p/q}\,, \quad t>s\ge 0\,, \tag{1.11}$$

in the sense of distributions. In addition, if $u_0 \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, there holds

$$\Delta_p u(t,x) \ge -\frac{N(p-1)}{q(q-1)} \, \frac{\|\nabla u_0\|_\infty^{p-q}}{t} \tag{1.12}$$

for $t>0$ in the sense of distributions.

The proof of Proposition 1.4 relies on the comparison principle combined with a gradient estimate established in [6].

Similar semiconvexity estimates for solutions to (1.1), (1.2) have already been obtained in [14] and [20, Lemma 5.1] for $p=q=2$, in [7, Proposition 3.2] for $p=2$ and $q\in(1,2]$, and in [9, Theorem 1] for $p=q>2$. We extend these results to the range $p>2$ and $q\in(1,p]$. As we shall see below, the estimate (1.11) plays an important role in the proof of Theorem 1.3 and is also helpful to construct a subsolution in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Let us finally emphasize that the validity of Proposition 1.4 is not restricted to non-negative solutions and that the solutions to the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.7) also enjoy the semiconvexity estimates (1.11) and (1.12). These two estimates thus stem from the reaction term $|\nabla u|^q$ and not from the diffusion.

In the next section, we recall the well-posedness of (1.1), (1.2) in $\mathcal{BUC}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, as well as some properties of the solutions established in [6]. We also show the finite speed of propagation of the support for non-negative compactly supported initial data. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of the semiconvexity estimates (Proposition 1.4) and Section 4 to that of Theorem 1.1. Theorem 1.3 is shown in the last section, its proof combining arguments of [7, 12, 18] used to established analogous results when $p=2$.

Throughout the paper, C and C_i, $i\ge 1$, denote positive constants depending only on p, q, and N. Dependence upon additional parameters will be indicated explicitly. Also, $\mathcal{M}_N(\mathbb{R})$ denotes the space of real-valued $N\times N$ matrices and $\delta_{ij}=1$ if $i=j$ and $\delta_{ij}=0$ if $i\ne j$, $1\le i,j\le N$. Given a matrix $A=(a_{ij})\in\mathcal{M}_N(\mathbb{R})$, $tr(A)$ denotes its trace and is given by $tr(A):=\sum a_{ii}$.

2 Preliminary results

Let us first recall the well-posedness (in the framework of viscosity solutions) of (1.1), (1.2), together with some properties of the solutions established in [6].

Proposition 2.1 *Consider a non-negative initial condition* $u_0 \in \mathcal{BUC}(\mathbb{R}^N)$*. There is a unique non-negative viscosity solution* $u \in \mathcal{BC}([0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N)$ *to* (1.1), (1.2) *such that*

$$0 \le u(t,x) \le \|u_0\|_\infty\,, \quad (t,x) \in Q_\infty\,, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_\infty \le \min\left\{ C_1\ \|u(s)\|_\infty^{1/q}\ (t-s)^{-1/q}, \|\nabla u(s)\|_\infty \right\}, \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u(t,x)-u(s,x))\ \vartheta(x)\ dx + \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u\cdot\nabla\vartheta - |\nabla u|^q\ \vartheta \right)\ dxd\tau = 0 \tag{2.3}$$

for $t > s \ge 0$ *and* $\vartheta \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$*. In addition,* $t \longmapsto \|u(t)\|_\infty$ *is a non-increasing function.*

Proof. We put $\tilde{u}_0 := \|u_0\|_\infty - u_0$. As $\tilde{u}_0$ is a non-negative function in $\mathcal{BUC}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, it follows from [6, Theorem 1.1] that there is a unique non-negative viscosity solution $\tilde{u}$ to

$$\partial_t\tilde{u} - \Delta_p\tilde{u} + |\nabla\tilde{u}|^q = 0\ , \quad (t,x) \in Q_\infty := (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N\,, \tag{2.4}$$

with initial condition $\tilde{u}(0,x) = \tilde{u}_0(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. It also satisfies $0 \le \tilde{u}(t,x) \le \|u_0\|_\infty$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\tilde{u}(t,x)-\tilde{u}(s,x))\ \vartheta(x)\ dx + \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(|\nabla\tilde{u}|^{p-2}\nabla\tilde{u}\cdot\nabla\vartheta + |\nabla\tilde{u}|^q\ \vartheta \right)\ dxd\tau = 0$$

for $t > s \ge 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and $\vartheta \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. In addition, $\nabla\tilde{u}(t)$ belongs to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for each $t > 0$ and

$$\|\nabla\tilde{u}(t)\|_\infty \le C_1\ \|\tilde{u}_0\|_\infty^{1/q}\ t^{-1/q}$$

by [6, Lemma 4.1]. Setting $u := \|u_0\|_\infty - \tilde{u}$, we readily deduce from the properties of $\tilde{u}$ that u is a non-negative viscosity solution to (1.1), (1.2) satisfying (2.1) and (2.3). Also, $\nabla u(t)$ belongs to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for each $t > 0$. The uniqueness and the time monotonicity of $\|u\|_\infty$ then both follow from the comparison principle, see [8] or [11, Theorem 2.1]. Finally, given $s \ge 0$, $(t,x) \mapsto \|u(s)\|_\infty - u(t+s,x)$ is the unique non-negative viscosity solution to the Cauchy problem (2.4) with initial condition $x \mapsto \|u(s)\|_\infty - u(s,x)$ and we infer from [6, Lemma 4.1] that

$$\|\nabla u(t+s)\|_\infty \le C_1\ \|\|u(s)\|_\infty - u(s)\|_\infty^{1/q}\ t^{-1/q} \le C_1\ \|u(s)\|_\infty^{1/q}\ t^{-1/q}$$

for $t > 0$, whence (2.2). □

We next turn to the propagation of the support of non-negative solutions to (1.1), (1.2) with non-negative compactly supported initial data.

Proposition 2.2 *Consider a non-negative solution* u *to* (1.1), (1.2) *with an initial condition* u_0 *satisfying* (1.3)*. Assume further that* u_0 *is compactly supported in a ball* $B(0,R_0)$ *of* $\mathbb{R}^N$ *for some* $R_0 > 0$*. Then* $u(t)$ *is compactly supported for each* $t \ge 0$*.*

Proof. We argue by comparison with travelling wave solutions. By [13, Application 9.4], there is a travelling wave solution w to the convection-diffusion equation

$$\partial_t w - \partial_1^2 \left(w^{p-1}\right) + \partial_1 \left(w^q\right) = 0\,, \quad (t,x_1) \in (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}\,, \tag{2.5}$$

with wave speed unity. It is given by $w(t,x_1) = f(x_1 - t)$ for $(t,x_1) \in (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}$, the function f being implicitly defined by

$$(p-1) \int_0^{f(y)} \frac{z^{p-3}}{1-z^{q-1}}\, dz = (-y)_+\,, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

In particular, f satisfies $f(y) = 0$ if $y > 0$ and $f(y) \to 1$ as $y \to -\infty$. Introducing

$$F(y) := \int_y^\infty f(z)\, dz\,, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

the properties of f ensure that F is a decreasing function on $(-\infty,0)$ with $F(y) = 0$ if $y > 0$, $F(y) \le |y|$ if $y < 0$, and $F(y) \to \infty$ as $y \to -\infty$. There is therefore a unique $\mu \in (-\infty,0)$ such that $F(R_0+\mu) = \|u_0\|_\infty$. In addition, it readily follows from (2.5) and the invariance by translation of (1.1) that $W_\mu(t,x) := F(x_1+\mu-t)$ is a travelling wave solution to (1.1). Now, u and W_μ are both solutions to (1.1) in $(0,\infty)\times H_+$, the half-space H_+ being defined by $H_+ := \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \ :\ x_1 > R_0\right\}$. Owing to the monotonicity of F, the bound $0 \le f \le 1$, and (2.1), we have also

$$u_0(x) - W_\mu(0,y) = 0 - W_\mu(0,y) \le W_\mu(0,x) - W_\mu(0,y) \le |x-y|$$

for $x \in H_+$ and $y \in H_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} u(t,x) - W_\mu(t,y) &\le \|u_0\|_\infty - W_\mu(t,y) \\ &\le F(R_0+\mu-t) - W_\mu(t,y) = W_\mu(t,x) - W_\mu(t,y) \le |x-y| \end{aligned}$$

for $t > 0$, $x \in \partial H_+$, $y \in H_+$, and

$$u(t,x) - W_\mu(t,y) \le \|u_0\|_\infty - F(R_0+\mu-t) \le 0$$

for $t > 0$, $x \in H_+$, $y \in \partial H_+$. We are then in a position to use the comparison principle stated in [11, Theorem 2.1] to conclude that $u(t,x) \le W_\mu(t,x)$ for $(t,x) \in (0,\infty)\times H_+$. Consequently, $u(t,x) \le F(x_1+\mu-t) = 0$ if $t \ge 0$ and $x_1 > \max\{R_0, t-\mu\}$, and the rotational invariance of (1.1) allows us to conclude that $u(t,x) = 0$ for $t \ge 0$ and $|x| > \max\{R_0, t-\mu\}$. $\square$

We finally recall the convergence to self-similar solutions for non-negative and compactly supported solutions to the p-Laplacian equation [17]

$$\partial_t \varphi = \Delta_p \varphi\ , \quad (t,x) \in Q_\infty\,. \tag{2.6}$$

Proposition 2.3 *Let φ_0 be a non-negative and compactly supported function in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and φ denote the unique weak solution to (2.6) with initial condition φ_0. Then*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} t^{(N(r-1))/(r(N(p-2)+p))} \ \left\|\varphi(t) - \mathcal{B}_{\|\varphi_0\|_1}(t)\right\|_r = 0 \quad \textit{for} \quad r \in [1,\infty]\,, \tag{2.7}$$

where $\mathcal{B}_L$ denotes the Barenblatt solution to (2.6) given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_L(t,x) &:= t^{-N/(N(p-2)+p)}\ b_L\left(xt^{-1/(N(p-2)+p)}\right)\,, \\ b_L(x) &:= \left(C_2\ L^{(p(p-2))/((p-1)(N(p-2)+p))} - C_3\ |x|^{p/(p-1)}\right)_+^{(p-1)/(p-2)} \end{aligned}$$

for $(t,x) \in (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N$ and $L > 0$.

The convergence (2.7) is proved in [17, Theorem 2] for $r = \infty$. As φ_0 is compactly supported, so is $\varphi(t)$ for each $t > 0$ and the support of $\varphi(t)$ is included in $B\left(0, C_4(\varphi_0)\ t^{1/(N(p-2)+p)}\right)$ for $t \geq 1$ [17, Proposition 2.2]. Combining this property with [17, Theorem 2] readily provide the convergence (2.7) for all $r \in [1,\infty)$.

3 Semiconvexity

In this section, we prove the semiconvexity estimates (1.11) and (1.12). To this end, we would like to derive an equation for $\Delta_p u$ to which we could apply the comparison principle. The poor regularity of u however does not allow to perform directly such a computation and an approximation procedure is needed. As a first step, we report the following result:

Lemma 3.1 *Let a and b be two non-negative function in $\mathcal{C}^\infty([0,\infty))$ satisfying*

$$a(r) > 0\,, \quad a'(r) > 0\,, \quad a'(r)\ b'(r) - a(r)\ b''(r) > 0\,, \tag{3.1}$$

$$c(r) := 2\ \left(\frac{b'}{a}\right)(r) + \frac{4r\ (a\ b'' - a'\ b')(r)}{a^2(r) + 2r\ a(r)\ a'(r)} \geq 0\,. \tag{3.2}$$

Consider a classical solution v to

$$\partial_t v - \ \mathit{div}\ \left(a\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ \nabla v\right) = b\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\,, \quad (t,x) \in Q_\infty\,, \tag{3.3}$$

and put

$$w := \ \mathit{div}\ \left(a\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ \nabla v\right) \quad \textit{and} \quad z_i := a\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ \partial_i v$$

for $i \in \{1,\ldots,N\}$. Then

$$\partial_t w - \mathcal{L}w - \mathcal{V}\cdot\nabla w - \frac{c\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)}{N}\ w^2 \geq 0 \quad \textit{in} \quad Q_\infty\,, \tag{3.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}w &:= \sum_{i,j} \partial_i \left(a\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ E_{ij}\ \partial_j w \right)\,, \quad \mathcal{V} := 2\, b'\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ \nabla v\,, \\
E_{ij} &:= \delta_{ij} + 2\,\frac{a'}{a}\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ \partial_i v\ \partial_j v\,, \quad 1 \le i,j \le N\,.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 3.1 borrows some steps from the proof of [9, Theorem 1] for $p = q > 2$ but requires additional arguments to handle the term coming from the fact that $q \neq p$. In particular, we recall the following elementary result which will be helpful to estimate this term.

Lemma 3.2 *Let A and B be two symmetric matrices in $\mathcal{M}_N(\mathbb{R})$ and put $M := ABA$. Then M is a symmetric matrix in $\mathcal{M}_N(\mathbb{R})$ and*

$$|MX|^2 \le tr\left(M^2\right)\ |X|^2 \quad \text{for} \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^N\,. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1. We first note that

$$\partial_j z_i = a\left(|\nabla v|^2\right) \sum_k E_{ik}\ \partial_k \partial_j v\,, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\partial_t z_i = a\left(|\nabla v|^2\right) \sum_k E_{ik}\ \partial_k \partial_t v\,, \tag{3.7}$$

for $1 \le i,j \le N$. According to the definition of w, we infer from (3.3), (3.6), and (3.7) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t w &= \sum_{i,k} \partial_i \left(a\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ E_{ik}\ \partial_k \partial_t v \right) \\
&= \sum_{i,k} \partial_i \left(a\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ E_{ik}\ \partial_k \left(w + b\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\right)\right) \\
&= \mathcal{L}w + 2 \sum_{i,k} \partial_i \left((ab')\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ E_{ik}\ \sum_j \partial_j v\ \partial_j \partial_k v \right) \\
&= \mathcal{L}w + 2 \sum_{i,j} \partial_i \left((ab')\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ \partial_j v\ \sum_k E_{ik}\ \partial_k \partial_j v \right) \\
&= \mathcal{L}w + 2 \sum_{i,j} \partial_i \left(\left(\frac{b'}{a}\right)\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ z_j\ \partial_j z_i \right) \\
&= \mathcal{L}w + 4 \sum_{i,j} \left(\frac{b'}{a}\right)'\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ \sum_k \partial_k v\ \partial_k \partial_i v\ z_j\ \partial_j z_i \\
&+\ 2 \sum_{i,j} \left(\frac{b'}{a}\right)\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ \partial_i z_j\ \partial_j z_i + 2 \sum_{i,j} \left(\frac{b'}{a}\right)\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ z_j\ \partial_j \partial_i z_i\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $w = \sum \partial_i z_i$, the last term of the right-hand side of the above inequality is equal to $\mathcal{V} \cdot \nabla w$ and

$$\begin{aligned}(3.8) \qquad \partial_t w &= \mathcal{L}w + \mathcal{V} \cdot \nabla w + 4 \left[a \left(\frac{b'}{a} \right)' \right] \left(|\nabla v|^2 \right) \sum_{i,j,k} \partial_j v \; \partial_k v \; \partial_k \partial_i v \; \partial_j z_i \\ &+ 2 \left(\frac{b'}{a} \right) \left(|\nabla v|^2 \right) \sum_{i,j} \partial_i z_j \; \partial_j z_i \, .\end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, introducing the matrix $\mathcal{E} := (E_{ij})$ and the Hessian matrix $D^2 v = (\partial_i \partial_j v)$ of v, we infer from (3.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i,j} \partial_i z_j \; \partial_j z_i &= a^2 \left(|\nabla v|^2 \right) \sum_{i,j,k,l} E_{ik} \; \partial_k \partial_j v \; E_{jl} \; \partial_l \partial_i v \\ &= a^2 \left(|\nabla v|^2 \right) \sum_{i,j} \left(\mathcal{E} \; D^2 v \right)_{ij} \; \left(\mathcal{E} \; D^2 v \right)_{ji} \\ (3.9) \qquad \sum_{i,j} \partial_i z_j \; \partial_j z_i &= a^2 \left(|\nabla v|^2 \right) \; tr \left(\left(\mathcal{E} \; D^2 v \right)^2 \right) .\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using once more (3.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i,j,k} \partial_j v \; \partial_k v \; \partial_k \partial_i v \; \partial_j z_i &= a \left(|\nabla v|^2 \right) \sum_{i,j,k,l} \partial_j v \; \partial_k v \; \partial_k \partial_i v \; E_{il} \; \partial_l \partial_j v \\ &= a \left(|\nabla v|^2 \right) \sum_{i,l} \left(\sum_k \partial_i \partial_k v \; \partial_k v \right) \; E_{il} \; \left(\sum_j \partial_l \partial_j v \; \partial_j v \right) \\ (3.10) \sum_{i,j,k} \partial_j v \; \partial_k v \; \partial_k \partial_i v \; \partial_j z_i &= a \left(|\nabla v|^2 \right) \; \left\langle D^2 v \; \nabla v, (\mathcal{E} \; D^2 v) \; \nabla v \right\rangle .\end{aligned}$$

Inserting (3.9) and (3.10) in (3.8), we end up with

$$\begin{aligned}(3.11) \qquad \partial_t w &= \mathcal{L}w + \mathcal{V} \cdot \nabla w + 2 \; (ab') \left(|\nabla v|^2 \right) \; tr \left(\left(\mathcal{E} \; D^2 v \right)^2 \right) \\ &+ 4 \; (a \; b'' - a' \; b') \left(|\nabla v|^2 \right) \; \left\langle D^2 v \; \nabla v, (\mathcal{E} \; D^2 v) \; \nabla v \right\rangle .\end{aligned}$$

We next observe that

$$(3.12) \qquad \mathcal{E} \; \nabla v = \left(1 + 2 \; |\nabla v|^2 \; \left(\frac{a'}{a} \right) \left(|\nabla v|^2 \right) \right) \; \nabla v$$

and that, for $X \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$\langle \mathcal{E} \; X, X \rangle = |X|^2 + 2 \; \left(\frac{a'}{a} \right) \left(|\nabla v|^2 \right) \; \langle X, \nabla v \rangle^2 \geq |X|^2$$

as a and a' are both positive by (3.1). Consequently, $\mathcal{E}$ is a positive definite symmetric matrix in $\mathcal{M}_N(\mathbb{R})$ and there exists a positive definite matrix $\mathcal{E}_{1/2}$ such that $\mathcal{E}_{1/2}^2 = \mathcal{E}$. We then infer from the definition of $\mathcal{E}_{1/2}$, (3.12), and Lemma 3.2 (with $A = \mathcal{E}_{1/2}$, $B = D^2 v$ and $X = \mathcal{E}_{1/2}^{-1}\ \nabla v$) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle D^2 v\ \nabla v, (\mathcal{E}\ D^2 v)\ \nabla v \right\rangle &= \left|(\mathcal{E}_{1/2}\ D^2 v)\ \nabla v\right|^2 \\
&= \left| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{1/2}\ D^2 v\ \mathcal{E}_{1/2}\right)\ \mathcal{E}_{1/2}^{-1} \right)\ \nabla v \right|^2 \\
&\le tr\left(\mathcal{E}_{1/2}\ D^2 v\ \mathcal{E}_{1/2}\ \mathcal{E}_{1/2}\ D^2 v\ \mathcal{E}_{1/2}\right)\ \left\langle \mathcal{E}_{1/2}^{-1}\ \nabla v, \mathcal{E}_{1/2}^{-1}\ \nabla v \right\rangle \\
&\le tr\left(\left(\mathcal{E}\ D^2 v\right)^2 \right)\ \left\langle \nabla v, \mathcal{E}^{-1}\ \nabla v \right\rangle \\
&\le tr\left(\left(\mathcal{E}\ D^2 v\right)^2 \right)\ |\nabla v|^2\ \left(1 + 2\ |\nabla v|^2\ \left(\frac{a'}{a}\right) \left(|\nabla v|^2\right) \right)^{-1} .
\end{aligned}$$

Owing to the non-positivity (3.1) of $a\ b'' - a'\ b'$, we deduce from (3.11) and the above inequality that

$$\partial_t w \ge \mathcal{L} w + \mathcal{V} \cdot \nabla w + \left(a^2\ c\right) \left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ tr\left(\left(\mathcal{E}\ D^2 v\right)^2 \right) ,$$

the function c being defined in (3.2). We finally use the inequality

$$tr\left(A^2\right) \ge \frac{1}{N}\ tr(A)^2 , \quad A \in \mathcal{M}_N(\mathbb{R}) ,$$

the identity

$$w = \sum_i \partial_i z_i = a\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ tr\left(\mathcal{E}\ D^2 v\right) ,$$

and the non-negativity (3.2) of c to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t w &\ge \mathcal{L} w + \mathcal{V} \cdot \nabla w + \frac{1}{N}\ \left(a^2\ c\right) \left(|\nabla v|^2\right)\ tr\left(\mathcal{E}\ D^2 v\right)^2 \\
&\ge \mathcal{L} w + \mathcal{V} \cdot \nabla w + \frac{c\left(|\nabla v|^2\right)}{N}\ w^2 ,
\end{aligned}$$

and complete the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 1.4. To be able to use Lemma 3.1, we shall first construct a suitable approximation of (1.1), (1.2). Such a construction has already been performed in [6] for similar purposes and we recall it now. Given u_0 satisfying (1.3), there is a sequence of functions $(u_{0,k})_{k\ge 1}$ such that, for each integer $k \ge 1$, $u_{0,k} \in \mathcal{BC}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $u_0 \le u_{0,k+1} \le u_{0,k}$, and $(u_{0,k}, \nabla u_{0,k})_k$ converge towards $(u_0, \nabla u_0)$ uniformly on every compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$ as $k \to \infty$. Next, for $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and $r \ge 0$, we set

$$a_\varepsilon(r) := \left(r + \varepsilon^2\right)^{(p-2)/2} \quad \text{and} \quad b_\varepsilon(r) := \left(r + \varepsilon^2\right)^{q/2} - \varepsilon^q .$$

Then the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{aligned} (3.13)\qquad \partial_t u_{k,\varepsilon} &= \text{div}\ \left(a_\varepsilon\left(|\nabla u_{k,\varepsilon}|^2\right)\ \nabla u_{k,\varepsilon}\right) + b_\varepsilon\left(|\nabla u_{k,\varepsilon}|^2\right)\,, \quad (t,x)\in Q_\infty\,, \\ (3.14)\qquad u_{k,\varepsilon}(0) &= u_{0,k}+\varepsilon^\nu\,, \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^N\,, \end{aligned}$$

has a unique classical solution $u_{k,\varepsilon}$, the parameter $\nu>0$ depending p, q, and N and being appropriately chosen. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} (3.15)\qquad \|\nabla u_{k,\varepsilon}(t)\|_\infty &\le \|\nabla u_{0,k}\|_\infty\,, \quad t\ge 0\,, \\ (3.16)\qquad \lim_{k\to\infty}\ \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} u_{k,\varepsilon}(t,x) &= u(t,x)\,, \end{aligned}$$

the latter convergence being uniform on every compact subset of $[0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N$, see [6, Section 3] (after performing the same change of unknown function as in the proof of Proposition 2.1).

Introducing

$$c_\varepsilon(r) = 2\ \left(\frac{b_\varepsilon'}{a_\varepsilon}\right)(r) + \frac{4r\ (a_\varepsilon\ b_\varepsilon'' - a_\varepsilon'\ b_\varepsilon')(r)}{a_\varepsilon^2(r)+2r\ a_\varepsilon(r)\ a_\varepsilon'(r)}\,, \quad r\ge 0\,,$$

let us check that a_ε and b_ε fulfill the conditions (3.1) and (3.2). Clearly, $a_\varepsilon>0$ and $a_\varepsilon'>0$ as $p>2$. Next, since $1<q\le p$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(a_\varepsilon'\ b_\varepsilon' - a_\varepsilon\ b_\varepsilon''\right)(r) &= \frac{q\ (p-q)}{4}\ \left(r+\varepsilon^2\right)^{(p+q-6)/2} \ge 0\,, \\ c_\varepsilon(r) &= q\ \frac{r(q-1)+\varepsilon^2}{r(p-1)+\varepsilon^2}\ \left(r+\varepsilon^2\right)^{(q-p)/2} \ge 0\,. \end{aligned}$$

We may then apply Lemma 3.1 to deduce that $w_{k,\varepsilon} := \text{div}\ \left(a_\varepsilon\left(|\nabla u_{k,\varepsilon}|^2\right)\ \nabla u_{k,\varepsilon}\right)$ satisfies

$$\partial_t w_{k,\varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{k,\varepsilon} w_{k,\varepsilon} - \mathcal{V}_{k,\varepsilon}\cdot\nabla w_{k,\varepsilon} - \frac{c_\varepsilon\left(|\nabla u_{k,\varepsilon}|^2\right)}{N}\ w_{k,\varepsilon}^2 \ge 0$$

in Q_∞. Observe next that the condition $1<q\le p$ implies that c_ε is a non-increasing function. It then follows from (3.15) that $c_\varepsilon\left(|\nabla u_{k,\varepsilon}|^2\right) \ge c_\varepsilon\left(\|\nabla u_{0,k}\|_\infty^2\right)$ and we end up with

$$(3.17)\qquad \partial_t w_{k,\varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{k,\varepsilon} w_{k,\varepsilon} - \mathcal{V}_{k,\varepsilon}\cdot\nabla w_{k,\varepsilon} - \frac{c_\varepsilon\left(\|\nabla u_{0,k}\|_\infty^2\right)}{N}\ w_{k,\varepsilon}^2 \ge 0$$

in Q_∞. Clearly, $t\longmapsto -N/\left(c_\varepsilon\left(\|\nabla u_{0,k}\|_\infty^2\right)\ t\right)$ is a subsolution to (3.17) and the comparison principle warrants that

$$(3.18)\qquad w_{k,\varepsilon}(t,x) \ge -\frac{N}{c_\varepsilon\left(\|\nabla u_{0,k}\|_\infty^2\right)\ t}\,, \quad (t,x)\in Q_\infty\,.$$

Letting $\varepsilon\to 0$ and $k\to\infty$ in the previous inequality with the help of (3.16) gives (1.12).

Next, since (1.1) is autonomous, we infer from (2.2) (with $s = 0$) and (1.12) that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_p u(t,x) &\geq -\frac{2N(p-1)}{q(q-1)}\ \frac{\|\nabla u(t/2)\|_\infty^{p-q}}{t}\\ &\geq -\frac{2^{p/q}N(p-1)}{q(q-1)}\ C_1^{p-q}\ \|u_0\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q}\ t^{-p/q}\,,\end{aligned}$$

whence (1.11) for $s = 0$. To prove the general case $s \in (0,t)$, we use again the fact that (1.1) is autonomous. $\square$

We have a similar result when u_0 is more regular.

Corollary 3.3 *Assume that $p > 2$ and $q \in (1,p]$. Let u be the solution to* (1.1), (1.2) *with an initial condition u_0 satisfying $u_0 \in W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ in addition to* (1.3). *Then*

$$\Delta_p u(t,x) \geq -\left|\inf_{y\in\mathbb{R}^N} \Delta_p u_0(y)\right| \tag{3.19}$$

in the sense of distributions.

Proof. Keeping the notations introduced in the proof of Proposition 1.4, we readily infer from (3.17) and the comparison principle that

$$w_{k,\varepsilon}(t,x) \geq -\left|\inf_{y\in\mathbb{R}^N} \Delta_p u_{0,k}(y)\right|\,, \quad (t,x) \in Q_\infty\,. \tag{3.20}$$

Owing to the regularity of u_0, it is possible to construct the sequence $(u_{0,k})_k$ such that it satisfies

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \inf_{y\in\mathbb{R}^N} \Delta_p u_{0,k}(y) = \inf_{y\in\mathbb{R}^N} \Delta_p u_0(y)\,.$$

We may then pass to the limit first as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and then as $k \to \infty$ in (3.20) and use (3.16) and the above convergence to complete the proof. $\square$

Another useful consequence of the semiconvexity estimates derived in Proposition 1.4 is that the solution u to (1.1), (1.2) is a supersolution to a first-order Hamilton-Jacobi equation.

Corollary 3.4 *Consider an initial condition u_0 satisfying* (1.3). *Setting $F(t,\xi_0,\xi) := \xi_0 - |\xi|^q + \kappa_1\ \|u_0\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q}\ t^{-p/q}$ for $t \in (0,\infty)$, $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$ (recall that κ_1 is defined in* (1.11)*), the solution u to* (1.1), (1.2) *is a supersolution to $F(t,\partial_t w,\nabla w) = 0$ in Q_∞.*

Proof. We still use the notations introduced in the proof of Proposition 1.4. As $w_{k,\varepsilon} = \text{div}\ (a_\varepsilon(|\nabla u_{k,\varepsilon}|^2)\ \nabla u_{k,\varepsilon})$, we infer from (3.13) and (3.18) that

$$\partial_t u_{k,\varepsilon} - b_\varepsilon\left(|\nabla u_{k,\varepsilon}|^2\right) \geq -\frac{N}{c_\varepsilon\left(\|\nabla u_{0,k}\|_\infty^2\right)\ t}$$

in Q_∞. We then use (3.16) and the stability of viscosity solutions [1, 2, 8] to pass to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $k \to \infty$ in the previous inequality and conclude that u is a supersolution to

$$\partial_t w - |\nabla w|^q + \frac{N(p-1)}{q(q-1)}\ \frac{\|\nabla u_0\|_\infty^{p-q}}{t} = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad Q_\infty\,.$$

Now, fix $T \geq 0$. As (1.1) is an autonomous equation, the function $(t,x) \longmapsto u(t+T,x)$ is the solution to (1.1) with initial condition $u(T)$ and the above analysis allows us to conclude that u is a supersolution to

$$\partial_t w - |\nabla w|^q + \frac{N(p-1)}{q(q-1)}\ \frac{\|\nabla u(T)\|_\infty^{p-q}}{t-T} = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad (T,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N\,.$$

We then use (2.2) (with $T = t/2$) to complete the proof. □

4 Convergence to self-similarity

We change the variables and the unknown function so that the convergence (1.5) is transformed to the convergence towards a steady state. More precisely, we introduce the self-similar (or scaling) variables

$$\tau = \frac{1}{q}\ \log(1+t)\,, \qquad y = \frac{x}{(1+t)^{1/q}}\,,$$

and the new unknown function v defined by

$$u(t,x) = v\left(\frac{\log(1+t)}{q}, \frac{x}{(1+t)^{1/q}}\right)\,, \qquad (t,x) \in [0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N\,. \tag{4.1}$$

Equivalently, $v(\tau,y) = u\left(e^{q\tau}-1, ye^{\tau}\right)$ for $(\tau,y) \in [0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N$ and it follows from (1.1), (1.2) that v solves

$$\partial_\tau v = y\cdot\nabla v + q\ |\nabla v|^q + q\ e^{-(p-q)\tau}\ \Delta_p v\,, \quad (\tau,y) \in (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N\,, \tag{4.2}$$

$$v(0) = u_0\,, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^N\,. \tag{4.3}$$

We also infer from (2.1) and (2.2) that there is a positive constant $C_5(u_0)$ depending only on N, p, q, and u_0 such that

$$\|v(\tau)\|_\infty + \|\nabla v(\tau)\|_\infty \leq C_5(u_0)\,, \qquad \tau \geq 0\,, \tag{4.4}$$

while (1.4) reads

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \|v(\tau)\|_\infty = M_\infty > 0\,. \tag{4.5}$$

Formally, since $p > q$, the diffusion term vanishes in the large time limit and we expect the large time behaviour of the solution v to (4.2), (4.3) to look like that of the solutions to the first-order Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\partial_\tau w - y \cdot \nabla w - q\ |\nabla w|^q = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad Q_\infty\,. \tag{4.6}$$

Now, to investigate the large time behaviour of first-order Hamilton-Jacobi equations, an efficient approach has been developed in [21, 22] which relies on the relaxed half-limits method introduced in [3]. More precisely, for $(\tau, y) \in (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N$, we define the relaxed half-limits v_* and v^* by

$$v_*(y) := \liminf_{(\sigma,z,\lambda)\to(\tau,y,\infty)} v(\sigma+\lambda, z) \quad \text{and} \quad v^*(y) := \limsup_{(\sigma,z,\lambda)\to(\tau,y,\infty)} v(\sigma+\lambda, z)\,. \tag{4.7}$$

These relaxed half-limits are well-defined thanks to (4.4) and we first note that the right-hand sides of the above definitions indeed do not depend on $\tau > 0$. In addition,

$$0 \le v_*(x) \le v^*(x) \le M_\infty \quad \text{for} \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^N \tag{4.8}$$

by (4.5), while (4.4) and the Rademacher theorem ensure that v_* and v^* both belong to $W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Finally, by [2, Théorème 4.1] applied to equation (4.2), v^* and v_* are viscosity subsolution and supersolution, respectively, to the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\mathcal{H}(y, \nabla w) := -y \cdot \nabla w - q\ |\nabla w|^q = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N\,. \tag{4.9}$$

We now aim at showing that v^* and v_* coincide. However, the equation (4.9) has infinitely many solutions as $y \longmapsto \left(c - \gamma_q\ |y|^{q/(q-1)}\right)_+$ solves (4.9) for any $c > 0$ .The information obtained so far on v_* and v^* are thus not sufficient and are supplemented by the next two results.

Lemma 4.1 *Given $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, there is $R_\varepsilon > 1/\varepsilon$ such that*

$$v(\tau, y) \le \varepsilon \quad \textit{for} \quad \tau \ge 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0, R_\varepsilon)\,, \tag{4.10}$$

and $0 \le v_*(y) \le v^*(y) \le \varepsilon$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0, R_\varepsilon)$.

In other words, $v(\tau)$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for each $\tau \ge 0$ in a way which is uniform with respect to $\tau \ge 0$.

Proof. We first construct a supersolution to (4.2) in $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0,R)$ for R large enough. To this end, consider $R \ge R_c := 1 + \left(q\ (2\ \|u_0\|_\infty)^{q-1} + 3pq\ (2\ \|u_0\|_\infty)^{p-2}\right)^{1/q}$ and put $\Sigma_R(y) = \|u_0\|_\infty\ R^2\ |y|^{-2}$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0,R)$. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the parabolic operator defined by

$$\mathcal{L}w(\tau, y) := \partial_\tau w(\tau, y) - y \cdot \nabla w(\tau, y) - q\ |\nabla w(\tau, y)|^q - q\ e^{-(p-q)\tau}\ \Delta_p w(\tau, y)$$

for $(\tau,y)\in Q_\infty$ (so that $\mathcal{L}v=0$ by (4.2)). Then, if $y\in\mathbb{R}^N\setminus B(0,R)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}\Sigma_R(y) &= 2\ \Sigma_R(y) - q\ \frac{2^q}{|y|^q}\ \Sigma_R(y)^q + q\ 2^{p-1}\ \frac{N+2-3p}{|y|^p}\ \Sigma_R(y)^{p-1}\ e^{-(p-q)\tau} \\
&\ge 2\ \Sigma_R(y)\ \left\{ 1 - q\ (2\ \|u_0\|_\infty)^{q-1}\ \frac{R^{2(q-1)}}{|y|^{3q-2}} - 3pq\ e^{-(p-q)\tau}\ (2\ \|u_0\|_\infty)^{p-2}\ \frac{R^{2(p-2)}}{|y|^{3p-4}} \right\} \\
&\ge 2\ \Sigma_R(y)\ \left\{ 1 - q\ (2\ \|u_0\|_\infty)^{q-1}\ R^{-q} - 3pq\ e^{-(p-q)\tau}\ (2\ \|u_0\|_\infty)^{p-2}\ R^{-p} \right\} \\
&\ge 0
\end{aligned}$$

by the choice of R. Consequently, Σ_R is a supersolution to (4.2) in $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N\setminus B(0,R)$ for $R\ge R_c$.

Now, fix $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$. Since $u_0\in\mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^N)$, there is $\rho_\varepsilon\ge\max\{R_c,\varepsilon^{-1}\}$ such that $u_0(y)\le\varepsilon/2$ if $|y|\ge\rho_\varepsilon$. We then infer from the monotonicity of Σ_R and (2.1) that

$$u_0(y) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - \Sigma_{\rho_\varepsilon}(z) \le -\Sigma_{\rho_\varepsilon}(z) \le 0$$

if $|y|\ge\rho_\varepsilon$ and $|z|\ge\rho_\varepsilon$,

$$v(\tau,y) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - \Sigma_{\rho_\varepsilon}(z) \le \|u_0\|_\infty - \Sigma_{\rho_\varepsilon}(z) = \Sigma_{\rho_\varepsilon}(y) - \Sigma_{\rho_\varepsilon}(z) \le \frac{2\ \|u_0\|_\infty}{\rho_\varepsilon}\ |y-z|$$

if $|y|=\rho_\varepsilon$, $|z|\ge\rho_\varepsilon$, and $\tau\ge 0$, and

$$v(\tau,y) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - \Sigma_{\rho_\varepsilon}(z) \le \|u_0\|_\infty - \|u_0\|_\infty \le 0$$

if $|y|\ge\rho_\varepsilon$, $|z|=\rho_\varepsilon$, and $\tau\ge 0$. As $v-\varepsilon/2$ and $\Sigma_{\rho_\varepsilon}$ are subsolution and supersolution, respectively, to (4.2), the comparison principle [11, Theorem 4.1] warrants that $v(\tau,y)-\varepsilon/2\le\Sigma_{\rho_\varepsilon}(y)$ for $\tau\ge 0$ and $|y|\ge\rho_\varepsilon$. It remains to choose $R_\varepsilon\ge\rho_\varepsilon$ such that $\Sigma_{\rho_\varepsilon}(y)\le\varepsilon/2$ for $|y|\ge R_\varepsilon$ to complete the proof of (4.10). The last assertion of Lemma 4.1 is then a straightforward consequence of the definition (4.7) and (4.10). $\square$

We next use the semiconvexity estimate (1.11) (and more precisely its consequence stated in Corollary 3.4) to show that v_* lies above the profile H_∞ defined in (1.6).

Lemma 4.2 *For $y\in\mathbb{R}^N$, we have*

$$H_\infty(y) \le v_*(y) \le v^*(y)\,. \tag{4.11}$$

Proof. For $\tau\ge 0$, $y\in\mathbb{R}^N$, $\xi_0\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^N$, we set $\mathcal{F}(\tau,y,\xi_0,\xi) := \xi_0 - y\cdot\xi - q\ |\xi|^q + \kappa_2\ e^{-(p-q)\tau}$ with $\kappa_2 := q\ \kappa_1\ e^q/(e^q-1)$, the constant κ_1 being defined in (1.11). It then readily follows from Corollary 3.4 that

$$v \quad \text{is a supersolution to} \quad \mathcal{F}(\tau,y,\partial_\tau w,\nabla w)=0 \quad \text{in} \quad (1,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N\,. \tag{4.12}$$

We next fix $\tau_0 > 1$ and denote by V the (viscosity) solution to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\tau V - y \cdot \nabla V - q\ |\nabla V|^q &= 0\,, \qquad (\tau,y) \in (\tau_0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N\,, \\ V(\tau_0) &= v(\tau_0)\,, \qquad y \in \mathbb{R}^N\,. \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, a straightforward computation shows that the function $\tilde{V}$ defined by

$$\tilde{V}(\tau,y) := V(\tau,y) - \kappa_2 \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau} e^{-(p-q)s}\ ds\,, \qquad (\tau,y) \in (\tau_0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N\,,$$

is the (viscosity) solution to $\mathcal{F}(\tau,y,\partial_\tau \tilde{V}, \nabla \tilde{V}) = 0$ in $(\tau_0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N$ with initial condition $\tilde{V}(\tau_0) = v(\tau_0)$. Recalling (4.12), we infer from the comparison principle that

$$\tilde{V}(\tau,y) \le v(\tau,y) \quad \text{for} \quad (\tau,y) \in (\tau_0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N\,. \tag{4.13}$$

On the other hand, it follows from Proposition A.1 that

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^N} \left| V(\tau,y) - \left(\|v(\tau_0)\|_\infty - \gamma_q\ |y|^{q/(q-1)} \right)_+ \right| = 0\,.$$

We may then pass to the limit as $\tau \to \infty$ in (4.13) and use the definition (4.7) to conclude that

$$\left(\|v(\tau_0)\|_\infty - \gamma_q\ |y|^{q/(q-1)} \right)_+ - \kappa_2 \int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} e^{-(p-q)s}\ ds \le v_*(y) \le v^*(y)$$

for $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Letting $\tau_0 \to \infty$ in the above inequality with the help of (4.5) completes the proof of the lemma. □

We are now in a position to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. To this end, fix $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. Lemma 4.1 ensures that $v^*(y) \le \varepsilon$ for $|y| \ge R_\varepsilon \ge 1/\varepsilon$ while the continuity of H_∞ implies that there is $r_\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon)$ such that $H_\infty(y) \ge M_\infty - \varepsilon$ for $|y| \le r_\varepsilon$. Recalling (4.8), we realize that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{lll} v^*(y) - \varepsilon \le 0 \le H_\infty(y) & \text{if} & |y| = R_\varepsilon\,, \\ & & \\ v^*(y) - \varepsilon \le M_\infty - \varepsilon \le H_\infty(y) & \text{if} & |y| = r_\varepsilon\,. \end{array} \right. \tag{4.14}$$

Moreover, introducing $\psi(y) = -\gamma_q\ |y|^{q/(q-1)}/2$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}(y,\nabla\psi(y)) = \frac{q\gamma_q}{2(q-1)}\ |y|^{q/(q-1)} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{q-1}} \right) > 0 \quad \text{if} \quad r_\varepsilon < |y| < R_\varepsilon\,, \tag{4.15}$$

the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ being defined in (4.9). Summarizing, we have shown that H_∞ and $v^* - \varepsilon$ are supersolution and subsolution, respectively, to (4.9) in $\Omega_\varepsilon := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^N\ :\ r_\varepsilon < |y| < R_\varepsilon \right\}$ with $v^* - \varepsilon \le H_\infty$ on $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$ by (4.14). Owing to (4.15) and the concavity of $\mathcal{H}$ with respect to its second variable, we may apply [15, Theorem 1] to conclude that $v^* - \varepsilon \le H_\infty$ in Ω_ε.

This property being valid for each $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, we actually have $v^* \le H_\infty$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ by passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ thanks to the properties of r_ε and R_ε. Recalling (4.11), we have thus established that $v^* = v_* = H_\infty$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$. In particular, the property $v^* = v_*$ and the definition (4.7) provide the uniform convergence of $\{v(\tau)\}_{\tau \ge 0}$ towards $v^* = H_\infty$ on every compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$ as $\tau \to \infty$, see [2, Lemme 4.1] or [1, Lemma V.1.9]. Combining this local convergence with Lemma 4.1 actually gives

$$\lim_{\tau \to \infty} \|v(\tau) - H_\infty\|_\infty = 0\,. \tag{4.16}$$

Theorem 1.1 then readily follows after writing the convergence (4.16) in the original variables (t,x) for the function u and noticing that $\|h_\infty(1+t) - h_\infty(t)\|_\infty \longrightarrow 0$ as $t \to \infty$. □

5 Limit value of $\|u(t)\|_\infty$

This section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 1.4, for which three cases are to be distinguished and handled differently: $q \in (1, p-1]$, $q \in (p-1, q_\star]$, and $q \in (q_\star, p)$.

Proof of Proposition 1.4: $q \in (1, p-1]$. We proceed as in [18, Proposition 1] (where a similar result is proved for $p = 2$ and $q = 1$). For $\alpha > N/2$, $\delta > 0$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we set $\varrho_\delta(x) := (1 + \delta\ |x|^2)^{-\alpha}$. Clearly, $\varrho_\delta \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and it follows from (2.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varrho_\delta(x)\ u(t,x)\ dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left\{ \varrho_\delta(x)\ |\nabla u(t,x)|^q - |\nabla u(t,x)|^{p-2}\ \nabla u(t,x) \cdot \nabla \varrho_\delta(x) \right\}\ dx \\
&\ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varrho_\delta(x)\ |\nabla u(t,x)|^q\ \left(1 - |\nabla u(t,x)|^{p-1-q}\ \frac{|\nabla \varrho_\delta(x)|}{\varrho_\delta(x)} \right)\ dx\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\|\nabla u(t)\|_\infty \le \|\nabla u_0\|_\infty$ by (1.3) and (2.2) and noticing that $|\nabla \varrho_\delta| \le \alpha\ \delta^{1/2}\ \varrho_\delta$, we further obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varrho_\delta(x)\ u(t,x)\ dx \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varrho_\delta(x)\ |\nabla u(t,x)|^q\ \left(1 - \alpha\ \delta^{1/2}\ \|\nabla u_0\|_\infty^{p-1-q} \right)\ dx\,.$$

Choosing $\delta = \|\nabla u_0\|_\infty^{2(q+1-p)}/\alpha^2$ and integrating with respect to time give

$$\|u(t)\|_\infty\ \|\varrho_\delta\|_1 \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varrho_\delta(x)\ u(t,x)\ dx \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varrho_\delta(x)\ u_0(x)\ dx > 0\,.$$

We then pass to the limit as $t \to \infty$ to conclude that $M_\infty > 0$. □

We next turn to the case $q \in (p-1, q_\star]$ which turns out to be more complicated and requires two preparatory results.

Lemma 5.1 *Assume that* $q \in (1, q_\star]$ *and let* u *be a non-negative solution to* (1.1), (1.2) *with a compactly supported initial condition* u_0 *satisfying* (1.3)*. Then* $u(t) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ *for each* $t \geq 0$*, the function* $t \longmapsto \|u(t)\|_1$ *is non-decreasing and*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \|u(t)\|_1 = \infty\,. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. For every $t \geq 0$, $u(t)$ is bounded and compactly supported by (2.1) and Proposition 2.2, and is thus in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. The time monotonicity of the L^1-norm of u then readily follows from (2.3) with $\vartheta = 1$, a valid choice in this particular case as $u(t)$ is compactly supported. It further follows from (2.3) with $\vartheta = 1$ that

$$\|u(t)\|_1 \geq \|u(T)\|_1 + \int_T^t \|\nabla u(s)\|_q^q\, ds \quad \text{for } t > T \geq 0\,. \tag{5.2}$$

Consider next $T > 0$ and $t > T$. Recalling the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality

$$\|w\|_q \leq C_6\, \|\nabla w\|_q^{N(q-1)/(N(q-1)+q)}\, \|w\|_1^{q/(N(q-1)+q)}\,, \quad w \in W^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)\,, \tag{5.3}$$

we infer from (5.2), (5.3), and the time monotonicity of the L^1-norm of u that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t)\|_1^{1+(q^2/N(q-1))} &\geq \|u(t)\|_1^{q^2/N(q-1)} \left(\|u(T)\|_1 + \int_T^t \|\nabla u(s)\|_q^q\, ds \right) \\ &\geq \int_T^t \|u(s)\|_1^{q^2/N(q-1)}\, \|\nabla u(s)\|_q^q\, ds \\ &\geq C_7 \int_T^t \left(\|u(s)\|_q^q\right)^{(N(q-1)+q)/N(q-1)}\, ds\,. \end{aligned}$$

If φ denotes the solution to the p-Laplacian equation $\partial_t\varphi - \Delta_p\varphi = 0$ in Q_∞ with initial condition $\varphi(0) = u_0$, the comparison principle readily implies that

$$\varphi(t,x) \leq u(t,x)\,, \quad (t,x) \in Q_\infty\,. \tag{5.4}$$

Inserting this estimate in the previous lower bound for $\|u(t)\|_1$, we end up with

$$\|u(t)\|_1^{1+(q^2/N(q-1))} \geq C_7 \int_T^t \left(\|\varphi(s)\|_q^q\right)^{(N(q-1)+q)/N(q-1)}\, ds\,. \tag{5.5}$$

Now, by Proposition 2.3 we have

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} s^{N(q-1)/(N(p-2)+p)}\, \left\|\varphi(s) - \mathcal{B}_{\|u_0\|_1}(s)\right\|_q^q = 0$$

and

$$\left\|\mathcal{B}_{\|u_0\|_1}(s)\right\|_q^q = C_8\, s^{-N(q-1)/(N(p-2)+p)}\,,$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\varphi(s)\|_q^q & \ge \left(\left\| \mathcal{B}_{\|u_0\|_1}(s) \right\|_q - \left\| \varphi(s) - \mathcal{B}_{\|u_0\|_1}(s) \right\|_q \right)^q \\
& \ge s^{-N(q-1)/(N(p-2)+p)} \ \left(C_8 - \left\| \varphi(s) - \mathcal{B}_{\|u_0\|_1}(s) \right\|_q \right)^q \\
& \ge \left(\frac{C_8}{2} \right)^q \ s^{-N(q-1)/(N(p-2)+p)}
\end{aligned}$$

for $s \ge T$, provided T is chosen sufficiently large. Inserting this estimate in (5.5) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u(t)\|_1^{1+(q^2/N(q-1))} & \ge C_9 \int_T^t s^{-N(q-1)/(N(p-2)+p)} \ ds \\
& \ge C_{10} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} t^{(N+1)(q_\star-q)/(N(p-2)+p)} - T^{(N+1)(q_\star-q)/(N(p-2)+p)} & \text{if} \quad q \in (1, q_\star)\,, \\ & \\ \log(t/T) & \text{if} \quad q = q_\star\,. \end{array} \right.
\end{aligned}$$

We then let $t \to \infty$ to obtain the claimed result. $\square$

We next argue as in [12, Lemma 14] (for $p = 2$) to show that, if $q \in (p-1, p)$ and $M_\infty = 0$, then the L^∞-norm of $u(t)$ decays faster than an explicit rate.

Lemma 5.2 *Assume that $q \in (p-1, p)$ and let u be a non-negative solution to* (1.1), (1.2) *with an initial condition u_0 satisfying* (1.3). *If $M_\infty = 0$ in* (1.4), *then*

$$\|u(t)\|_\infty \le C_{11} \ t^{-(p-q)/(2q-p)} \quad \textit{for} \quad t > 0\,. \tag{5.6}$$

Observe that the assumptions $p > 2$ and $q \in (p-1, p)$ imply that $2q > p$ and $(p-q)/(2q-p) > 0$.

Proof. Consider a non-negative function $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with compact support in $B(0,1)$ and $\|\eta\|_1 = 1$. We then define a sequence of mollifiers $(\eta_\delta)_\delta$ by $\eta_\delta(x) := \eta(x/\delta)/\delta^N$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$. For $(t, x_0) \in Q_\infty$ and $T > t$, we take $\vartheta(x) = \eta_\delta(x - x_0)$ in (2.3) and infer from (1.11) (with $s = t/2$) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u(T)\|_\infty & \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u(T,x) \ \eta_\delta(x - x_0) \ dx \\
& \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u(t,x) \ \eta_\delta(x - x_0) \ dx - \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u(s,x)|^{p-2} \ \nabla u(s,x) \cdot \nabla \eta_\delta(t, x - x_0) \ dxds \\
& \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u(t,x) \ \eta_\delta(x - x_0) \ dx - 2^{p/q} \ \kappa_1 \ \left\| u\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \right\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q} \ \int_t^T (2s-t)^{-p/q} \ ds \\
& \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u(t,x) \ \eta_\delta(x - x_0) \ dx - C_{12} \ \left\| u\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \right\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q} \ \left(t^{(q-p)/p} - T^{(q-p)/p} \right)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Owing to the continuity of u, we may pass to the limit as $\delta \to 0$ in the above inequality and deduce that

$$\|u(T)\|_\infty \ge u(t,x_0) - C_{12} \left\| u\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \right\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q} \left(t^{(q-p)/p} - T^{(q-p)/p} \right) .$$

But the above inequality is valid for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and we thus end up with

$$\|u(T)\|_\infty \ge \|u(t)\|_\infty - C_{12} \left\| u\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \right\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q} \left(t^{(q-p)/p} - T^{(q-p)/p} \right) .$$

Finally, as $q < p$, we may let $T \to \infty$ in the previous inequality and use the assumption $M_\infty = 0$ to conclude that

$$\|u(t)\|_\infty \le C_{12} \left\| u\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \right\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q} t^{(q-p)/p} ,$$

or, equivalently, as $2q > p$,

$$t^{(p-q)/(2q-p)} \|u(t)\|_\infty \le C_{13} \left\{ \left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{(p-q)/(2q-p)} \left\| u\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \right\|_\infty \right\}^{(p-q)/q}$$

for $t \ge 0$. Introducing

$$A(t) := \sup_{s\in(0,t)} \left\{ s^{(p-q)/(2q-p)} \|u(s)\|_\infty \right\} \in [0,\infty) , \quad t \ge 0 ,$$

we deduce from the previous inequality that $A(t) \le C_{13}\, A(t)^{(p-q)/q}$, whence $A(t) \le C_{13}^{q/(2q-p)}$ for $t \ge 0$. This bound being valid for each $t > 0$, the proof of (5.6) is complete. □

Proof of Proposition 1.4: $q \in (p-1, q_\star]$.

Step 1: We first consider a compactly supported initial condition u_0 satisfying (1.3) and assume for contradiction that $M_\infty = 0$. On the one hand, according to Lemma 5.2 and the assumption $q \le q_\star$, there holds

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} t^{N/(N(p-2)+p)} \|u(t)\|_\infty \le C_{11}\, t^{(N(p+1)(q-q_\star))/((2q-p)(N(p-2)+p))} \le C_{11} . \tag{5.7}$$

On the other hand, fix $t_0 > 0$ and let φ be the solution to the p-Laplacian equation $\partial_t \varphi - \Delta_p \varphi = 0$ in Q_∞ with initial condition $\varphi(0) = u(t_0)$. As u_0 is compactly supported, so is $u(t_0)$ by Proposition 2.2 and $u(t_0)$ thus belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Moreover, the comparison principle warrants that $u(t,x) \ge \varphi(t-t_0,x)$ for $(t,x) \in [t_0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N$. We then infer from the above properties and Proposition 2.3 that, for $t > t_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} t^{N/(N(p-2)+p)} \, \|u(t)\|_\infty & \ge (t-t_0)^{N/(N(p-2)+p} \, \|u(t)\|_\infty \\ & \ge (t-t_0)^{N/(N(p-2)+p)} \, \|\varphi(t-t_0)\|_\infty \\ & \ge (t-t_0)^{N/(N(p-2)+p)} \, \left\| \mathcal{B}_{\|u(t_0)\|_1}(t-t_0) \right\|_\infty \\ & \quad - (t-t_0)^{N/(N(p-2)+p)} \, \left\| \mathcal{B}_{\|u(t_0)\|_1}(t-t_0) - \varphi(t-t_0) \right\|_\infty \\ & \ge C_{14} \, \|u(t_0)\|_1^{N/(N(p-2)+p)} \\ & \quad - (t-t_0)^{N/(N(p-2)+p)} \, \left\| \mathcal{B}_{\|u(t_0)\|_1}(t-t_0) - \varphi(t-t_0) \right\|_\infty . \end{aligned}$$

Using once more Proposition 2.3, we may pass to the limit as $t \to \infty$ in the previous inequality to obtain

$$\liminf_{t\to\infty} t^{N/(N(p-2)+p)} \, \|u(t)\|_\infty \ge C_{14} \, \|u(t_0)\|_1^{N/(N(p-2)+p)} . \tag{5.8}$$

Combining (5.7) and (5.8) yields $\|u(t_0)\|_1 \le C_{15}$ for all $t_0 > 0$ which contradicts Lemma 5.1. Therefore, $M_\infty > 0$.

Step 2: Now, if u_0 is an arbitrary initial condition satisfying (1.3), there clearly exists a compactly supported initial condition $\tilde{u}_0$ satisfying (1.3) and such that $u_0 \ge \tilde{u}_0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Introducing the solution $\tilde{u}$ to (1.1) with initial condition $\tilde{u}_0$, the comparison principle entails that $u \ge \tilde{u}$ in Q_∞, hence

$$M_\infty \ge \lim_{t\to\infty} \|\tilde{u}(t)\|_\infty .$$

The first step of the proof ensures that the right-hand side of the above inequality is positive which completes the proof. □

It remains to investigate the case $q \in (q_\star, p)$, for which we adapt the proof of [7, Theorem 2.4(b)].

Proof of Proposition 1.4: $q \in (q_\star, p)$**.** We put

$$m_0 := \left| \inf_{y\in\mathbb{R}^N} \Delta_p u_0(y) \right| .$$

As in the proof of Lemma 5.1, let $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be a non-negative function with compact support in $B(0,1)$ and $\|\eta\|_1 = 1$, and define a sequence of mollifiers $(\eta_\delta)_\delta$ by $\eta_\delta(x) := \eta(x/\delta)/\delta^N$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$. For $(t,x_0) \in Q_\infty$ and $T \in (0,t)$, we take $\vartheta(x) = \eta_\delta(x-x_0)$ in (2.3) and infer from (1.11) (with $s=0$) and Corollary 3.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t)\|_\infty & \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u(t,x) \, \eta_\delta(x-x_0) \, dx \\ & \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_0(x) \, \eta_\delta(x-x_0) \, dx - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u(s,x)|^{p-2} \, \nabla u(s,x) \cdot \nabla \eta_\delta(t, x-x_0) \, dxds \\ & \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_0(x) \, \eta_\delta(x-x_0) \, dx - \int_0^T m_0 \, ds - \kappa_1 \, \|u_0\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q} \int_T^t s^{-p/q} \, ds \\ & \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_0(x) \, \eta_\delta(x-x_0) \, dx - T \, m_0 - C_{16} \, \|u_0\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q} \, \left(T^{(q-p)/p} - t^{(q-p)/p} \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Owing to the continuity of u_0, we may pass to the limit as $\delta \to 0$ in the above inequality and deduce that

$$\|u(t)\|_\infty \ge u_0(x_0) - T\ m_0 - C_{16}\ \|u_0\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q}\ \left(T^{(q-p)/p} - t^{(q-p)/p} \right) .$$

Since $q < p$, we may let $t \to \infty$ in the above inequality and take the supremum with respect to x_0 to conclude that

$$M_\infty \ge \|u_0\|_\infty - T\ m_0 - C_{16}\ \|u_0\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q}\ T^{(q-p)/p} .$$

Next, for $\beta \in (0,1)$, the choice $T = \|u_0\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q}\ (\beta + m_0)^{-q/p}$ in the previous inequality yields

$$M_\infty \ge \|u_0\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q}\ \left(\|u_0\|_\infty^{p/q} - (1 + C_{16})\ (\beta + m_0)^{(p-q)/p} \right) .$$

This inequality being valid for every $\beta \in (0,1)$, we conclude that

$$M_\infty \ge \|u_0\|_\infty^{(p-q)/q}\ \left(\|u_0\|_\infty^{p/q} - (1 + C_{16})\ m_0^{(p-q)/p} \right) > 0$$

as soon as (1.10) is fulfilled with $\kappa_0 = (1 + C_{16})^{p/q}$. ☐

A Convergence for the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (4.6)

In this section, we study the large behaviour of non-negative solutions to the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (4.6) with initial data in $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and show their convergence to a steady state uniquely determined by the L^∞-norm of the initial data. Though the large time behaviour of solutions to first-order Hamilton-Jacobi equations has received considerable attention in recent years (see [4, 5, 16, 21, 22] and the references therein), the particular case of (4.6) does not seem to have been investigated in the literature. We thus provide a simple proof relying on the Hopf-Lax-Oleinik formula.

Proposition A.1 *Let $q > 1$ and consider a non-negative function $h_0 \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Let h be the unique viscosity solution to the Cauchy problem*

$$\partial_\tau h - y \cdot \nabla h - q\ |\nabla h|^q = 0 , \qquad (\tau, y) \in (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N , \tag{A.1}$$

$$h(0) = h_0 , \qquad y \in \mathbb{R}^N . \tag{A.2}$$

Then

$$\lim_{\tau \to \infty} \|h(\tau) - h_s\|_\infty = 0 \tag{A.3}$$

with

$$h_s(y) := \left(\|h_0\|_\infty - \gamma_q\ |y|^{q/(q-1)} \right)_+ , \qquad y \in \mathbb{R}^N ,$$

the constant $\gamma_q = (q-1)\ q^{-q/(q-1)}$ being defined in Theorem 1.1.

Thanks to the concavity of the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}(y,\xi) = -y\cdot\xi - q\ |\xi|^q$, $(y,\xi)\in\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N$, with respect to its second variable, the Hopf-Lax-Oleinik formula provides a representation formula for the solution h to (A.1), (A.2) which can be used to prove (A.3).

Proof. We first recall that h is given by the Hopf-Lax-Oleinik formula

$$h(\tau,y) = \sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}^N} \left\{ h_0(z) - \gamma_q\ \left| y - z\ e^{-\tau} \right|^{q/(q-1)}\ \left(1 - e^{-q\tau} \right)^{-1/(q-1)} \right\}$$

for $(\tau,y)\in[0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N$, see, e.g., [10, Chapter 3]. Since $h(\tau,y)\ge h_0(ye^\tau)\ge 0$, we have in fact

$$h(\tau,y) = \sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}^N} \left\{ \left(h_0(z) - \gamma_q\ \left| y - z\ e^{-\tau} \right|^{q/(q-1)}\ \left(1 - e^{-q\tau} \right)^{-1/(q-1)} \right)_+ \right\}$$

for $(\tau,y)\in[0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N$.

Consider now $\beta\in(0,1)$. As $h_0\in\mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^N)$, there is $R_\beta > (\|h_0\|_\infty/\gamma_q)^{(q-1)/q}$ such that

$$h_0(z)\le\beta \quad \text{for} \quad |z|\ge R_\beta\,. \tag{A.4}$$

On the one hand, if $(\tau,y)\in[\log R_\beta,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^N$ and $z\in\mathbb{R}^N$, we have either $|z|\ge R_\beta$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left(h_0(z) - \gamma_q\ \left| y - z\ e^{-\tau} \right|^{q/(q-1)}\ \left(1 - e^{-q\tau} \right)^{-1/(q-1)} \right)_+ - \left(h_0(z) - \gamma_q\ |y|^{q/(q-1)}\ \right)_+ \right| \\ \le\ & \left(h_0(z) - \gamma_q\ \left| y - z\ e^{-\tau} \right|^{q/(q-1)}\ \left(1 - e^{-q\tau} \right)^{-1/(q-1)} \right)_+ + \left(h_0(z) - \gamma_q\ |y|^{q/(q-1)} \right)_+ \\ \le\ & 2\ \beta \end{aligned}$$

by (A.4) or $z\in B(0,R_\beta)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left(h_0(z) - \gamma_q\ \left| y - z\ e^{-\tau} \right|^{q/(q-1)}\ \left(1 - e^{-q\tau} \right)^{-1/(q-1)} \right)_+ - \left(h_0(z) - \gamma_q\ |y|^{q/(q-1)}\ \right)_+ \right| \\ \le\ & \gamma_q\ \left| y - z\ e^{-\tau} \right|^{q/(q-1)}\ \left\{ \left(1 - e^{-q\tau} \right)^{-1/(q-1)} - 1 \right\} + \gamma_q\ \left| \left| y - z\ e^{-\tau} \right|^{q/(q-1)} - |y|^{q/(q-1)} \right| \\ \le\ & \gamma_q\ \left(|y| + R_\beta\ e^{-\tau} \right)^{q/(q-1)}\ \left\{ \left(1 - e^{-q\tau} \right)^{-1/(q-1)} - 1 \right\} + \frac{q\ \gamma_q}{q-1}\ \left(|y| + |z|\ e^{-\tau} \right)^{1/(q-1)}\ |z|\ e^{-\tau} \\ \le\ & \gamma_q\ \left(|y| + 1 \right)^{1/(q-1)}\ \left\{ \frac{q}{q-1} + |y| + 1 \right\}\ \left\{ \left(1 - e^{-q\tau} \right)^{-1/(q-1)} - 1 + R_\beta\ e^{-\tau} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

as $\tau\ge\log R_\beta$. Combining the above two estimates give

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| h(\tau,y) - \sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}^N} \left\{ \left(h_0(z) - \gamma_q\ |y|^{q/(q-1)}\ \right)_+ \right\} \right| \\ \le\ & C(q)\ \left(|y| + 1 \right)^{q/(q-1)}\ \left\{ \left(1 - e^{-q\tau} \right)^{-1/(q-1)} - 1 + R_\beta\ e^{-\tau} \right\} + 2\ \beta\,, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$|h(\tau,y) - h_s(y)| \le C(q)\ \left(|y| + 1 \right)^{q/(q-1)}\ \left\{ \left(1 - e^{-q\tau} \right)^{-1/(q-1)} - 1 + R_\beta\ e^{-\tau} \right\} + 2\ \beta \tag{A.5}$$

for $(\tau,y) \in [\log R_\beta,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N$. On the other hand, if $\tau \ge \log(R_\beta)$, $|y| \ge Y := 1 + (\|h_0\|_\infty/\gamma_q)^{(q-1)/q}$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have either $|y - z\ e^{-\tau}| \ge Y-1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & h_0(z) - \gamma_q\ \left| y - z\ e^{-\tau} \right|^{q/(q-1)}\ \left(1-e^{-q\tau}\right)^{-1/(q-1)} \\ \le\ & \left(1-e^{-q\tau}\right)^{-1/(q-1)}\ \left\{ \|h_0\|_\infty\ \left(1-e^{-q\tau}\right)^{1/(q-1)} - \gamma_q\ \left| y - z\ e^{-\tau} \right|^{q/(q-1)} \right\} \\ \le\ & \left(1-e^{-q\tau}\right)^{-1/(q-1)}\ \left\{ \|h_0\|_\infty - \gamma_q\ (Y-1)^{q/(q-1)} \right\} \\ \le\ & 0\,, \end{aligned}$$

or $|y - z\ e^{-\tau}| < Y-1$ and

$$|z| \ge |y\ e^\tau| - |z - y\ e^\tau| \ge Y\ e^\tau - (Y-1)\ e^\tau = e^\tau \ge R_\beta\,,$$

so that

$$h_0(z) - \gamma_q\ \left| y - z\ e^{-\tau} \right|^{q/(q-1)}\ \left(1-e^{-q\tau}\right)^{-1/(q-1)} \le \beta$$

by (A.4). Therefore,

$$h(\tau,y) \le \beta \quad \text{for} \quad (\tau,y) \in [\log R_\beta,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(0,Y)\,. \tag{A.6}$$

The claim (A.3) then easily follows from (A.5) and (A.6). □

References

[1] Martino Bardi and Italo Capuzzo-Dolcetta, *Optimal Control and Viscosity Solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman Equations*, Systems Control Found. Appl., Birkhäuser, Boston, 1997.

[2] Guy Barles, *Solutions de Viscosité des Equations d'Hamilton-Jacobi*, Mathématiques & Applications **17**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.

[3] Guy Barles and Benoît Perthame, *Exit time problems in optimal control and vanishing viscosity method*, SIAM J. Control Optim. **26** (1988), 1133–1148.

[4] Guy Barles and Jean-Michel Roquejoffre, *Ergodic type problems and large time behaviour of unbounded solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **31** (2006), 1209–1225.

[5] Guy Barles and Panagiotis E. Souganidis, *On the large time behavior of solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **31** (2000), 925–939.

[6] Jean-Philippe Bartier and Philippe Laurençot, *Gradient estimates for a degenerate parabolic equation with gradient absorption and applications*, J. Funct. Anal. **254** (2008), 851–878.

[7] Saïd Benachour, Grzegorz Karch, and Philippe Laurençot, *Asymptotic profiles of solutions to viscous Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **83** (2004), 1275–1308.

[8] Michael G. Crandall, Hitoshi Ishii, and Pierre-Louis Lions, *User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **27** (1992), 1–67.

[9] Juan R. Esteban and Pierangelo Marcati, *Approximate solutions to first and second order quasilinear evolution equations via nonlinear viscosity*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **342** (1994), 501–521.

[10] Lawrence C. Evans, Partial Differential Equations, Grad. Stud. Math. **19**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1998.

[11] Yoshikazu Giga, Shun'ichi Goto, Hitoshi Ishii, and Moto-Hiko Sato, *Comparison principle and convexity preserving properties for singular degenerate parabolic equations on unbounded domains*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **40** (1991), 443–470.

[12] Brian H. Gilding, *The Cauchy problem for $u_t = \Delta u + |\nabla u|^q$, large-time behaviour*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **84** (2005), 753–785.

[13] Brian H. Gilding and Robert Kersner, *Travelling Waves in Nonlinear Diffusion-Convection Reaction*, Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. **60**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2004.

[14] Richard S. Hamilton, *A matrix Harnack estimate for the heat equation*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **1** (1993), 113–126.

[15] Hitoshi Ishii, *A simple, direct proof of uniqueness for solutions of the Hamilton-Jacobi equations of eikonal type*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **100** (1987), 247–251.

[16] Hitoshi Ishii, *Asymptotic solutions for large time of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in Euclidean n space*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **25** (2008), 231–266.

[17] Shoshana Kamin and Juan Luis Vázquez, *Fundamental solutions and asymptotic behaviour for the p-Laplacian equation*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **4** (1988), 339–354.

[18] Philippe Laurençot and Philippe Souplet, *Optimal growth rates for a viscous Hamilton-Jacobi equation*, J. Evolution Equations **5** (2005), 123–135.

[19] Philippe Laurençot and Juan Luis Vázquez, *Localized non-diffusive asymptotic patterns for nonlinear parabolic equations with gradient absorption*, J. Dynamics Differential Equations **19** (2007), 985–1005.

[20] Chi-Tien Lin and Eitan Tadmor, *L^1-stability and error estimates for approximate Hamilton-Jacobi solutions*, Numer. Math. **87** (2001), 701–735.

[21] Gawtum Namah and Jean-Michel Roquejoffre, *Remarks on the long time behaviour of the solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **24** (1999), 883–893.

[22] Jean-Michel Roquejoffre, *Convergence to steady states or periodic solutions in a class of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **80** (2001), 85–104.

[23] Thomas Strömberg, *The Hopf-Lax formula gives the unique viscosity solution*, Differential Integral Equations **15** (2002), 47–52.